

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff(s),  
  
v.  
  
JOHN AMARALABORDE, et al.,  
  
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-cr-0077-JCM-NJK  
**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is an order to show cause why the stipulated protective order with respect to Defendant Faris should not be vacated. Docket No. 33. The response thereto also seeks reconsideration of the Court's denial of the stipulated protective order with respect to Defendant Amaralaborde. *See* Docket No. 34 at 7; *see also* Docket No. 32 (order denying without prejudice stipulated protective order). The Court held a hearing on these matters on May 9, 2017. Docket No. 37.

The question before the Court is a discrete one, whether Defendants in this case should be given copies of discovery that include the personal identifying information of their alleged victims. These copies would be available to Defendants for their review in the prison law library. *See* Docket No. 34 at 6. "At any time the court may, for good cause, deny, restrict, or defer discovery or inspection, or grant other appropriate relief." Fed. R. Crim. Pro. 16(d)(1). As the use of the word "may" connotes, the conditions under which the defense may obtain discovery is subject to the discretion of the Court. *See, e.g., In re Terrorist Bombings of U.S. Embassies in E. Africa*, 552 F.3d 93, 122 (2d Cir. 2008). In determining whether a protective order should be entered, the Court is also mindful of other applicable requirements,

1 including the requirement in the Crime Victims' Rights Act that, *inter alia*, crime victims have the "right  
2 to be reasonably protected from the accused." 18 U.S.C. § 3771(a)(1). The Court finds the proposal to  
3 provide Defendants copies of discovery with personal identifying information, as currently written, runs  
4 afoul of this provision of the Crime Victims' Rights Act.

5 As articulated at the detention hearings in this case, the Government contends that Defendants have  
6 a history of non-compliance with previous Court orders (including failure to appear and violation of terms  
7 of probation) and that they pose a risk of danger to the community. *See* Hearing Rec. (3/20/17) at 3:37 -  
8 3:38 p.m.; Hearing Rec. (4/26/17) at 3:17 - 3:18 p.m. The Government also explained at the hearing held  
9 on the instant matters that Defendants engaged in the theft of mail in this case, at least in part, for the  
10 purpose of misusing the alleged victims' personal identifying information. *See* Hearing Rec. (5/9/2017)  
11 at 8:37 - 8:38 a.m. Providing Defendants access to the very information the Government contends they  
12 misused is highly problematic. *See, e.g., United States v. Griffin*, 2014 WL 1767201, at \*1-2 (S.D. Miss.  
13 May 2, 2014).

14 Despite the Government's contentions, it now seeks to give Defendants copies of discovery  
15 containing personal identifying information of their alleged victims because (1) the discovery is  
16 "voluminous" and (2) a protective order will ensure compliance. Docket No. 34 at 3, 5.<sup>1</sup> Neither position  
17 is persuasive. First, the discovery in this case is estimated at 700 pages in length. *See* Docket No. 30 at  
18 2. That is not voluminous discovery. Second, the Government's position that a protective order will  
19 suffice to protect the rights of the alleged victims runs counter to its previous contentions that Defendants  
20  
21  
22

---

23 <sup>1</sup> The citation to *United States v. Vaughn* does not support the position advocated here, as that court  
24 ordered that witness and victim identification and contact information must be produced in unredacted form  
25 to defense counsel but not to the defendant. 2008 WL 4615030, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2008) ("Any  
26 disclosure pursuant to this order, or derived from information produced pursuant to this order shall be  
27 attorneys' eyes only . . . all [viewing] persons shall be identified to the government and they shall sign a  
28 protective order to be prepared by the government which precludes dissemination to any other person,  
including the defendant, of the disclosed information" (emphasis added)). The Court echos the sentiment  
of Judge Hollows that "the undersigned has no doubt that the defense lawyers in this case . . . would not  
negligently or purposefully disobey a protective order." *Id.*

1 have a history of non-compliance with Court orders and may be in the business of misusing personal  
2 identifying information for criminal gain.<sup>2</sup>

3 In short, the Court finds that giving Defendants copies of discovery with their alleged victims'  
4 personal identifying information is not appropriate in this case. While it is clear that the Government could  
5 in fact redact the personal identifying information, it appears the better course in this case would be to  
6 segregate the evidence containing personal identifying information (which appears to be limited to some  
7 of the opened mail and the law enforcement summary spreadsheet), and to only permit Defendants to  
8 review those documents in the presence of defense counsel. *See Griffin*, 2014 WL 1767201, at \*1-2  
9 (affirming magistrate judge's ruling permitting detained defendant accused of identity theft access to  
10 discovery with his alleged victims' personal identifying information only when in the presence of his  
11 counsel). The segregated discovery shall remain in the possession of defense counsel.

12 For these reasons, the Court hereby **VACATES** the stipulated protective order with respect to  
13 Defendant Faris. The Court further **DENIES** the request to reconsider the Court's order on the stipulated  
14 protective order with respect to Defendant Amaralaborde. The parties shall file, no later than May 16,  
15 2017, amended stipulated protective orders that comport with this order.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED

17 Dated: May 9, 2017

18  
19   
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 <sup>2</sup> The position that the protective order will suffice to protect the alleged victims because the  
27 Defendants are in custody is similarly lacking. *See* Docket No. 34 at 6 (outlining procedures for prisoners  
28 to review discovery materials). Those procedures do not prevent Defendants from, *inter alia*, making notes  
regarding the materials, and such notes could include the personal identifying information of the alleged  
victims.